

Minutes of the Special and Regular Meetings of February 14, 2006

SPECIAL MEETINGS

COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Feierbach, Lieberman, Dickenson, Warden, Mathewson

COUNCILMEMBERS ABSENT: None

Staff Present: Interim City Manager Crist, City Attorney Zafferano, Community Development Director de Melo, Public Works Director Davis, Police Chief Mattei, City Clerk Cook.

STUDY SESSION - 6:30 P.M.

Discussion and Direction on Automated Red Light Camera Enforcement

Police Sergeant Halleran stated that red light running was the greatest traffic hazard in the City of Belmont. He reviewed traffic volumes, as well as accident and violation statistics at the Ralston Avenue/El Camino Real intersection. The installation of a red-light camera system would likely reduce the number of violations and incidents. He described the system, including the process for the issuance of citations. Two potential locations in Belmont include Ralston Avenue/El Camino Real, and Ralston Avenue/Hiller Street. He noted that the City of San Mateo's program is cost-neutral.

In response to Council questions, Sergeant Halleran stated that the size of the maintenance boxes differ by vendor. He clarified that Cal Trans approval is required if the devices are to be placed along El Camino Real. He noted that the revenue from citations would need to be sufficient to cover the staff time required to implement this program. He clarified that administration does not require a sworn officer, but no other cities use volunteers. A grace period is common at the commencement of the program, and there would be public outreach in the beginning. Other cities using similar programs have not experienced any negative issues.

Sergeant Halleran noted that per the California Vehicle Code, a violation under this system is treated the same as if an officer had issued the ticket, but he noted that this is being challenged in some communities. He also recommended strategic sign placement at the main entrances to the city in order to advise drivers that a red light program is in place somewhere within the community.

Council discussion ensued regarding sign placement.

Councilmember Dickenson supported installing signs right away for future installation. He does not want to depend on the revenue, since the goal is a safer intersection.

Councilmember Feierbach expressed concern that if signs were put in place, violations would reduce, thereby offsetting the revenue to cover the cost of the program. Sergeant Halleran noted that any potential vendor would first perform a feasibility study to ascertain whether or not the program is warranted.

Councilmember Lieberman cited a similar program in place in the United Kingdom, and he noted that the goal is safety. The revenue would probably not be meaningful.

Mayor Mathewson stated that this is a safety consideration, and he supported pursuit of this program for Belmont.

Council concurred to direct staff to continue pursuing this matter and to bring back additional information for potential implementation.

Discussion and Direction regarding Draft Noise Ordinance language

Code Enforcement Officer Buckman noted this is a quality of life issue. He reviewed the effective hours and definitions contained in the draft ordinance. He stated the ordinance proposes to measure decibel levels, and he gave examples of various decibel levels. He noted that this ordinance would affect any construction or project requiring a City permit, or Planning Commission or City Council approval, and would not affect maintenance or minor projects. The City would need to procure a decibel reader in order to fully implement the ordinance.

Discussion ensued regarding affected hours as proposed in the ordinance. Code Enforcement Officer Buckman noted that more hours of construction operation would be permissible under the new ordinance, but enforcement tools would be in place. After-hours enforcement is to be performed by the police department. He noted that businesses not in compliance under new provisions would be given six months to come into compliance. Each would be handled individually and given due process.

In response to Councilmember Warden, Code Enforcement Officer Buckman clarified that special events would be exempt from the ordinance, but that volume levels for sports practices and games may need to be adjusted to be in compliance.

In response to Councilmember Dickenson, Community Development Director de Melo stated that a conditional use permit (CUP) takes precedence over the noise ordinance, and clarified that Notre Dame High School's CUP is stricter than the proposed ordinance.

Council concurred to move forward with the enactment of a noise ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT at this time, being 7:30 P.M., these Study Sessions were adjourned.

REGULAR MEETING - 7:40 P.M.

ROLL CALL

COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Feierbach, Lieberman, Dickenson, Warden, Mathewson

COUNCILMEMBERS ABSENT: None

Staff Present: Interim City Manager Crist, City Attorney Zafferano, Community Development Director de Melo, Public Works Director Davis, Finance Director Fil, Fire Chief Lowden, Police Chief Mattei, City Clerk Cook.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Led by City Clerk Cook

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

Proclamation Congratulating Friends of the Belmont Library for Achieving Fundraising Goal of \$350,000

Pam Clarke, President, Friends of the Belmont Library (FOBL), thanked the community for its generosity in enabling FOBL to reach and exceed its goal of \$350,000. She stated that students from Notre Dame de Namur University (NDNU) were helping to unpack books and materials.

Cheri Hariri, FOBL, stated that now that the fundraising efforts have been successful, FOBL's focus would be on increasing membership. She displayed the new logo for the new library.

Mayor Mathewson encouraged residents to become members of the Friends of the Belmont Library.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Judy King, Fifth Avenue, stated that plans are under way for the 100th Anniversary Celebration for the Manor House (in 2008). She stated the goal was to prepare the building for National Registry of Historic Buildings, which would include the demolition of the police department and restoration. She requested information on when to apply for funding from the City of Belmont for this celebration.

AGENDA AMENDMENTS

Mayor Mathewson stated that due to the extensive nature of tonight's City Council, Redevelopment and Fire Protection District agendas, the City Council Item 9's may be postponed.

Councilmember Warden requested the removal of Consent Item 4-D (Resolution Approving the Purchase of Three Police Vehicles and One Truck for the Parks Department from S & C Ford for an Amount not to Exceed \$91,907.84) for separate consideration.

ITEMS APPROVED ON CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval of Minutes of Special and Regular Meetings of January 10, 2006

Acceptance of Written Communications: 1) Received February 2, 2006, from the Public Utilities Commission regarding PG&E's Notice of Filing of Optional Climate Protection Program.

Adoption of Ordinance 1013 amending Municipal Code Chapter 2, Article VII (Finance Commission)

Approval of Resolution 9749 Specifying Official Functions for Which Reimbursement of Costs of Attendance Is Authorized and Approving a Reimbursement Policy

ACTION: On a motion by Councilmember Feierbach, seconded by Councilmember Warden, the Consent Agenda was unanimously approved, as amended, by a show of hands.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION

Resolution Approving the Purchase of Three Police Vehicles and One Truck for the Parks Department from S & C Ford for an Amount not to Exceed \$91,907.84

Councilmember Warden noted that only one bid had been received for this item, and that his desire was for due diligence on these expenditures. Finance Director Fil responded that only certain automobile dealers have access to vehicles from the State funding list.

ACTION: On a motion by Councilmember Warden, seconded by Councilmember Dickenson, Resolution 9750 Approving the Purchase of Three Police Vehicles and One Truck for the Parks Department from S & C Ford for an Amount not to Exceed \$91,907.84 was unanimously approved by a show of hands.

HEARINGS

Councilmember Dickenson stated that he would be recusing himself from both Public Hearing Appeals (2700 Monserat and 905 South Road) since he was the Vice Chair of the Planning Commission at the time these items were before the Commission, and he rendered a decision on both. He stepped off the dais and vacated the room at this time.

Public Hearing to Consider an Appeal of the Planning Commission Decision Denying a Floor Area Exception, Variance, Conditional Use Permit, and Single Family Design Review for Property Located at 2700 Monserat Avenue (cont. from 11/22/05 and 1/10/06)

Community Development Director de Melo reviewed the Planning Commission consideration of and decision to deny the application. He noted that staff has addressed all of the concerns raised by the appellant in their appeal documentation, and that there is nothing contained therein to warrant overturning the Commission's decision.

Mayor Mathewson opened the Public Hearing, and outlined the procedures for time limits for all speakers.

Craig Howard, Applicant/Appellant, stated that this was his dream home. He noted that the information contained in his appeal documentation is important to their situation. He stated that there is confusion regarding work done by him and work done by the previous owner. He purchased the home without knowing that it was already too large. The previous owner advised there was no problem regarding the zoning. Visually the home is the same as others in the neighborhood, and he noted that he has received support from the neighbors for his application, especially the closest neighbor most affected. Parking is adequate. He is seeking a logical solution. He described the meeting with the City Attorney where he was provided with an ultimatum, and that he should present his solution to the City Council. There is a significant cost to comply with current regulations. He was then advised to withdraw his proposal to the City Council since it would not likely entertain a modified project. He cited other applications that were modified following Council direction.

Mr. Howard stated that other cities are more lenient regarding secondary dwelling units. He noted that most houses do not meet city standards, and clear direction is needed for applicants.

In response to Council questions, Mr. Howard stated that he hired a real estate agent for this transaction and he did not seek any information from City Hall regarding this property. He responded that he obtained an inspection and a title report. He noted the real estate documents indicated that there had been work done on the property without the benefit of a permit. His real

estate agent did not express concern that the home appeared larger than the size cited. When asked if he knew of the risk of purchasing property with non-permitted work, Mr. Howard responded that it was suggested he have the work inspected for code compliance. No liability of the seller's agent was mentioned. This was an as-is sale, the property was in a state of disrepair and not in turnkey condition, and the price was lower as a result. He declined to state whether or not he had lived in the property since its purchase.

Mayor Mathewson opened the Public Hearing. No one came forward to speak.

ACTION: On a motion by Councilmember Warden, seconded by Councilmember Feierbach, the Public Hearing was unanimously closed by a show of hands (4-0, Dickenson recused).

Councilmember Feierbach stated that she attended the Planning Commission hearings on this matter, and would make the same findings the Commission made, and supports its decision. She has read the material. She suggested the applicant/appellant seek relief from the realtor. She added that a variance is available if no other options exist to satisfy code requirements, regardless of the size of the variance request.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that he cannot make the findings to grant a variance. He noted that a 1400 square foot variance is excessive. This is a unique situation, and the applicant may have been given bad advice. He also noted that a real estate agent should have been able to tell the difference in the square footage. He commented that the staff report was comprehensive. He questioned whether there might be a compromise solution.

In response to Councilmember Warden, City Attorney Zafferano clarified that there is no distinction between a proposed plan and the legalization of existing additional floor area. The Planning Commission and the City Council should treat the legalization of existing as new floor area even if it has been in place for a long time. The City has no obligation to grant a variance to legalize illegal construction.

Councilmember Warden stated that the remedy in this situation is a civil matter between the owner and the real estate agent, who is paid to give advice. He clarified that the Council has the right to negotiate and compromise, but it does not normally exercise this right, since making a deal with the City Council throws off the process. The Planning Commission made the appropriate findings, and he will uphold its decision. He added that he has sympathy for the applicant.

Mayor Mathewson stated he reviewed all the documents, and cannot make the findings to grant the variance. He concurs that the remedy lies with the real estate agent. He noted that the Planning Commission performed an extensive review of this matter, and its decision to deny was unanimous.

ACTION: On a motion by Councilmember Feierbach, seconded by Councilmember Warden, and unanimously approved by a show of hands (4-0, Dickenson recused) to approve Resolution 9752 Upholding the Planning Commission Decision Denying a Floor Area Exception, Variance,

Conditional Use Permit, and Single Family Design Review for Property Located at 2700 Monserat Avenue.

Public Hearing to Consider an Appeal of the Planning Commission decision approving a Single Family Design Review and Variance for Property at 905 South Road

Community Development Director de Melo reviewed the Planning Commission hearing process on this matter, as well as the history with the project. He reviewed the staff response to the appeal document, and noted there is no basis to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to approve this project.

Councilmember Feierbach expressed concern regarding the safety of the congregate care facility during the construction phase of the project, due to the steep grade. She commented that an applicant has a right to build on a lot of record.

Community Development Director de Melo responded that conditions of approval have been strengthened to address the staging of equipment and other construction-related issues. He noted that other building permit-related conditions would be addressed, should the Council uphold the Planning Commission's approval of the project. He also responded that access to the property requires a variance, whether for a bridge driveway or driveway retaining walls. He noted the applicant's sole variance request is for retaining walls.

Mary Lou South, Appellant, stated that the issue is simple, but the solution is not. She noted that the City code addresses single-family issues, but since the adjacent property, Belmont Vista, is not a residence, requirements are different. This is a health, safety and privacy issue for the residence and the staff at the facility. She noted Belmont Vista is a skilled nursing facility which operates on a 24-hour basis, which could present a privacy issue for the residents of the new home. She stated that the Graves will need liability insurance, and will need to disclose the home's proximity to this facility. She commented that perhaps not every lot should be built on.

Simmie Graves, Project Applicant, stated that he had doubts about the approval process for his project, but noted its success in the end. He stated that the appellant has offered no geotechnical data to address her concerns other than the data for her own property. He is willing to work with the appellant regarding options for staging of equipment during construction.

In response to Councilmember Feierbach, Mr. Graves clarified that if there is no other location available, a staging platform will be constructed on site. He shares the concerns expressed regarding safety, and noted this will be addressed at the appropriate time.

Mayor Mathewson opened the Public Hearing.

John Blake, on behalf of the Project Applicant (Graves), stated that the conditions of approval require liability insurance, which will be provided. In response to Council questions, Mr. Blake noted that the parameters regarding construction equipment are outlined in the conditions of approval.

Community Development Director de Melo clarified that the building permit process will address this issue through the submission of a Construction Management Plan. He noted the City Attorney will also review this document, and a building permit will not be issued unless all conditions have been met. He noted that Council has sufficient documentation before it to address the entitlement question. Alternate construction staging areas may be feasible, and the Chief Building Official and the geotechnical expert will make this determination.

In response to Councilmember Lieberman, Community Development de Melo stated that additional documentation to follow the entitlement process will determine whether or not it is feasible to build on the subject property.

Councilmember Feierbach noted that the same engineers as were used for Belmont Vista were being used for this project, and there were discrepancies in that case. She requested a review of the Construction Management Plan prior to the issuance of a building permit. It is important to protect the residents of Belmont Vista.

Councilmember Warden stated that Councilmembers are not experts in this area, and expressed concern about reviewing such a document.

Mayor Mathewson expressed concern regarding the ability of South Road to withstand this type of construction. Community Development Director de Melo responded that the Public Works Department and Cotton Shires (geotechnical expert) will review off-site improvements to determine this question, although no issues have yet been identified.

Mary Lou South, Appellant, stated that many of the issues raised in this discussion were not addressed by the Planning Commission, and she shares the Council's concern regarding the condition of South Road. There is no space for equipment staging. She noted that the Belmont Vista project required an additional \$3 million for soils work when springs were discovered on the property. The building permit process should require public review, not just an internal review.

Ann Parsons, General Partner/Paradigm Health Care, questioned how much liability insurance could be obtained to take care of 33 patients.

Simmie Graves, Project Applicant, stated he shares the safety concerns expressed. He clarified that Mr. Chu, his geotechnical expert, is not the original expert used on the Belmont Vista project. Mr. Chu recommended a different foundation system than was originally planned for that project, which is the same process for his proposed project on South Road. He noted that Mr. Chu will be on site throughout the entire building process.

ACTION: On a motion by Councilmember Lieberman, seconded by Councilmember Warden, the Public Hearing was unanimously closed by a show of hands (4-0, Dickenson recused).

In response to Mayor Mathewson's question regarding the appropriateness of further Council review of conditions of building, City Attorney Zafferano stated that Council cannot determine the conditions, but can impose them. The applicants are the ones to determine the insurance risk.

RECESS: 9:05 P.M.
RECONVENE: 9:10 P.M.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that he would not like to see an accident on the construction site, regardless of the level of insurance acquired, and that this is an economic risk for the property owner to determine. The applicant has been diligent in this process. He would direct staff to deal with the issue of safety. The property may not be buildable, which is also a risk of the owner.

Councilmember Feierbach stated that a variance is required for this project, as there is no other way to build without it. She supports the Planning Commission's decision in this matter. She expressed her continued concerns regarding construction safety.

Councilmember Warden recommended the addition of a clause to indemnify the City of Belmont. He noted this is not an ideal house site, and expressed concern regarding safety issues. He noted that staff is aware this is an important issue. He also supports the Planning Commission's decision.

Mayor Mathewson concurred with Council comments. He noted the applicant followed the design process and addressed most issues. He also shares concern regarding safety. He expressed confidence that staff will review all building documents and will oversee this project. He supports the addition of an indemnification clause. He, too, supports the Planning Commission decision, and concurred that a variance is necessary to build on this property. He commented he does not like bridge driveways, and does not like large retaining walls, either.

ACTION: Councilmember Warden made a motion, seconded by Councilmember Lieberman, to uphold the Planning Commission decision approving a Single Family Design Review and Variance for Property at 905 South Road.

ACTION: Councilmember Feierbach proposed an amendment to the original motion to include City Council review of the Construction Management Plan prior to issuance of the building permit.

Councilmember Warden stated he does not want the Council to have the liability for oversight or approval of the Management Plan, but he would be amenable to receive the Plan for information only.

Councilmember Feierbach clarified that her amendment is to receive the document for review only. Councilmember Warden stated he would accept this amendment under that condition.

In response to Mayor Mathewson, Community Development Director de Melo noted that an additional condition naming the City of Belmont as additional insured would be included as previously discussed.

Councilmember Warden expressed the desire to avoid personal liability for or oversight of a technical document.

ACTION: Mayor Mathewson seconded the amended motion made by Councilmember Feierbach to include City Council receipt of the Construction Management Plan prior to issuance of the building permit.

ACTION: On a motion originally made by Councilmember Warden, seconded by Councilmember Lieberman, as amended by Councilmember Feierbach, and unanimously approved by a show of hands (4-0, Dickenson recused), to uphold the Planning Commission decision approving a Single Family Design Review and Variance for Property at 905 South Road.

Councilmember Dickenson returned to the Chambers and the dais.

Public Hearing to Consider a Resolution Accepting \$100,000 from the State of California Citizens Option for Public Safety (COPS)

Police Captain Wood stated that the report outlines the spending plan for these funds, which are to be used for front-line law enforcement by subsidizing the costs for a new police officer. He reviewed previous years' expenditures.

Mayor Mathewson opened the Public Hearing. No one came forward to speak.

ACTION: On a motion by Councilmember Warden, seconded by Councilmember Dickenson, Resolution 9753 Accepting \$100,000 from the State of California Citizens Option for Public Safety (COPS) was unanimously approved by a show of hands.

Public Hearing to Consider an Ordinance amending Article I, Section 5-1 et seq. of the Belmont Municipal Code (Animal Control)

City Attorney Zafferano stated that the proposed ordinance included language as previously directed by Council. He clarified that this ordinance addresses only the dangerous animal portion of the Municipal Code dealing with animals. He also clarified that the ordinance does not cite specific animal breeds.

Mayor Mathewson opened the Public Hearing. No one came forward to speak.

ACTION: On a motion by Councilmember Warden, seconded by Councilmember Dickenson, the Public Hearing was unanimously approved by a show of hands.

Councilmember Warden expressed concern regarding the vague language addressing one animal killing another, and recommended the insertion of the word "domestic" to clarify this issue. City Attorney Zafferano responded that this minor modification would be made to the final ordinance language.

ACTION: On a motion by Councilmember Warden, seconded by Councilmember Dickenson, and unanimously approved by a show of hands to introduce an ordinance amending Article I,

Section 5-1 et seq. of the Belmont Municipal Code (Animal Control), amended as noted, to waive further reading, and set the second reading and adoption for February 28, 2006.

NEW BUSINESS

Request from the Belmont/Namur Sister City Committee to Place a Peace Pole at the New Library

Interim Parks and Recreation Director Bridges stated that no specific site location had been identified for the installation of a peace pole, since the Library was still under construction. He noted the Sister City Committee's desire was to hold the dedication of the peace pole when the delegation from Namur was in Belmont in April.

Judie Davis, Sister City Committee, provided a brief history of peace poles. She described how peace poles were part of the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City. She noted the condolence letter sent to the City of Belmont by the Mayor of Namur following September 11, 2001. She explained the peace pole would be tangible evidence of the existence of the Sister City relationship.

Judy King, Parks and Recreation Commissioner, stated that there has been more interest in this small issue than in the water feature at the Library costing thousands of dollars. She noted this is a quiet, non-intrusive item. It is not religious, is not art, and is not political. She noted its installation is supported by the Friends of the Belmont Library, the Library staff, the Parks and Recreation Commission, and many citizens.

Mayor Mathewson stated that everyone is in favor of peace. He commented that the peace pole is a political statement that does not belong on public property. It may be more appropriate to be installed at the Notre Dame de Namur campus. It is not a good use of public funds, since the funds for the Sister City Committee came from the City. He would support a more appropriate piece of art for the Library site.

Councilmember Feierbach stated she visited the Millbrae park where a peace pole is located. She noted it is worn, the plastic is cracking, and it is not attractive. The message is a hope and a prayer, which are not ingredients to bring peace. The Library needs an elegant piece of art which will withstand time and the weather. She recommended the peace pole be placed on private property.

Councilmember Dickenson stated that he attended the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting where this item was discussed. The only pole located at the Library should be a flagpole. Books are for opinions. Approving the peace pole opens the door for other opinions.

Councilmember Warden stated that this issue is similar to the one recently addressed by the Council regarding the motto "In God We Trust". He recognizes the gesture of good will, but noted the peace pole has political implications.

COMMISSION, COMMITTEE, AND COUNCIL INTERGOVERNMENTAL ASSIGNMENT UPDATES, AND STAFF ITEMS

Proposal for a Pilot Project in Belmont to Address the Safety of Senior Pedestrians in the Ralston/Alameda Neighborhood

Interim Parks and Recreation Director Bridges stated that Parks and Recreation Commissioner Rich Bortoli was appointed to serve on a regional steering committee to discuss senior pedestrian safety. He presented the committee's findings to the Commission, which felt it was beyond the scope of its review of issues.

Rich Bortoli, Parks and Recreation Commissioner, stated that the region is experiencing growth in its aging population, and there is a need to find ways to assist with mobility. He participated in a subcommittee to address pedestrian safety, and focused the discussion on the Carlmont Shopping Center area. He stated some cities have done studies to assess pedestrian safety. There may be grants available for assessing the situation, but noted that there may be costs for future implementation.

Councilmember Warden expressed his support to add this to the Priority Calendar for ranking.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that some of Belmont's streets are challenging for anyone to walk. He also supports further review of this issue.

Interim Parks and Recreation Director Bridges stated that he does not want to miss potential grant opportunities, and will do some initial work prior to the Priority Calendar process. Commissioner Bortoli stated he would assist in order to defray staff time.

Council concurred to have staff pursue grant opportunities and to place this item on the Priority Calendar.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councilmember Dickenson announced that he recently toured the new Highway 101 Interchange project with Public Works staff. He noted that Council could direct Cal Trans to remove vegetation which would improve the area and better prepare for the bike/pedestrian bridge. The landscape plan is meager, and he would like the City arborist to review the area to propose improvements.

Mayor Mathewson stated that the Council cannot take action on this item as it is not on the agenda, but staff could look into this and report back to Council.

Mayor Mathewson announced his upcoming State of the City address to be held at Ralston Hall on February 28th.

MATTERS OF COUNCIL INTEREST/CLARIFICATION

Council concurred to continue the following items to the meeting of February 28, 2006:

Discussion regarding suggested Council format for Item 9's (Warden)

Discussion and direction regarding adding a community event "Afternoon Tea" (Dickenson)

Discussion and direction regarding new library dedication (Mayor)

Consideration of restructuring of Parks and Recreation Department to consolidate with Public Works (Dickenson)

Discussion and direction regarding reinstatement of Community Service Officer (CSO) position (Dickenson)

Councilmember Dickenson expressed his desire to reinstate the CSO position lost during recent reductions in Police Department staffing. He noted the staff is stretched, which is a major concern. He also noted that it takes two years to bring a new police officer on board, and a CSO position could be implemented more quickly. He commented that government was initially formed for public safety, and CSO's provide support to the sworn officers.

Finance Director Fil stated this matter could be addressed during the upcoming mid-year review. If Council wishes to enact this position, budgetary trade-offs would be needed. He noted that other police personnel issues will also be addressed during the mid-year review.

Councilmember Dickenson responded he would like to make this a priority at mid-year.

Councilmember Warden stated he would be willing to look at options for this expenditure.

Councilmember Lieberman stated he would need more information in order to evaluate this recommendation, since there may be material consequences if enacted.

ADJOURNMENT at this time, being 10:05 P.M.

Terri Cook

Belmont City Clerk

Meeting Tape Recorded and Videotaped

Audio Recording 626

minutes approved 3/14/06